



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

cev

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/924,270	08/07/2001	Kenji Takahashi	MM4461	4894

7590 01/12/2004

Anderson, Kill & Olick, P.C.
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10020-1182

EXAMINER

PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2653

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/924,270

Applicant(s)

TAKAHASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Aristotelis M Psitos

Art Unit

2653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 October 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 2653

DETAILED ACTION

Applicants' response of 10/27/03 has been considered with the following results.

Specification

The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: In particular the phrase "side by side relationship" is not found in the disclosure. As interpreted by the examiner "side by side" does not mean next to each other, but rather spaced apart. Hence the projections are --- side by side --- but not next to each other.

As far as the examiner interprets the claims and recite positive limitations, the following rejections are made.

As amended, claim 1 is drawn to fig. 13, one embodiment, while claims 2-7 are drawn to fig. 5 another embodiment. No restriction is given, e.g. different species since the examiner concludes these to be obvious variants over each other.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2653

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Masunaga.

Masunaga, the lens is element 147, lens holder – element 148, suspension holder 142 (a), frame 30, plurality of elastic supports 153, and actuator – not shown. With respect to the plurality of projections and the “another projection” applicants' attention is drawn to the description starting at col. 7 with respect to the figures wherein the “another” projection is either of the 30a or 153 a projections found on the lens holder 148 while there is a plurality of projections on the suspension holder – 153a.

As amended and interpreted, the claim recites a plurality of projections, wherein these projections are found on the lens holder – see figure 2 in Masunaga and the frame – see the description with respect to the frame elements 30a, or 153a.

Hence, the examiner finds the elements as claimed found in the Masunaga reference.

With respect to the argument that the document fails to disclose the functionality (functional limitation) that the projections act as stoppers the examiner interprets the function as a conclusion from

Art Unit: 2653

the elements positively recited in the claim, hence because these elements are found in Masunaga, the claimed stopping action also is present.

2. Claims 2 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by either Masunaga. Tomiyama et al

With respect to the independent claim, the above documents depict a protrusion/projection at various locations:

a) Masunaga, the lens is element 147, lens holder – element 148, suspension holder 142 (a), frame 30, plurality of elastic supports 153, and actuator – not shown. With respect to the plurality of projections and the “another projection” applicants’ attention is drawn to the description starting at col. 7 with respect to the figures wherein the “another” projection is either of the 30a or 153 a projections found on the lens holder 148 while there is a plurality of projections on the suspension holder – 153a.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 2, the elastic supports are fixed to the first projections, either the top or bottom portion of element 153b – see figure 9, while the second projection is the remaining projection, i.e., the bottom or top portion of the projection 153b.

As amended and interpreted, the claim recites a plurality of projections, wherein these projections are found on the lens holder – see figure 2 in Masunaga and the frame – see the description with respect to the frame elements 30a, or 153a.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The examiner has not ignored the functional language contained in claim 1, that these projections act as stoppers. The examiner interprets the projections in claim 1 to be those found on the frame and the lens holder. These are found in the Masunaga reference. With respect to the functional limitation with respect to these acting as stoppers that restrict rotation of the lens holder, the examiner concludes that this function follows from the structure of elements found in the claim, and hence since these elements are found, it also flows from the reference.

Art Unit: 2653

b) Tomiyama et al – see figures 2 and 4. The projections are 2b, 2c, 2d, 2e attached to the lens holder, while projects 6a,6b,6c,and 6d are the projections attached to the suspension holder.

With respect to claim 1, the first projections – either those attached to the suspension holder and the “another” projection is any one of 2b,c,d,e.

With respect to claim 2, the first projections any of 2b,c,d,e and the second projections any of the remaining projections 2b,c,d,e.

As far as the examiner interprets applicants' termed projections, the above documents meet this limitation. The remaining claimed elements are self-evident.

Furthermore, as best as examiner can interpret from the above documents, the limitations of claim 7 follow, the outer surfaces of these projections project from the lens holder approximately the same distance.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 10/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Again, the examiner concludes that the stopping action is a conclusion from the elements provided, and hence because these elements are found in the reference, the stopping ability is met.

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the cited documents above with respect to claim 2 further considered with JP 62-031036.

With respect to claim 3, the position defined is considered evident in the JP document.

The examiner interprets the limitations of claim 3 as a relocation of the projections, i.e., a relocation of parts, and obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, since the function would still be retained.

The positioning of the projections would be a matter of choice by the manufacturer of the lens holder, as part of any molding technique. No unexpected results/or criticality is seen to occur from relocating these projections.

With respect to the limitations of claim 4, since there are four projections in the base reference, these limitations are met.

Art Unit: 2653

4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the art as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Wada et al.

Selection of elastic elements as defined in claim 6 is taught by the Wada et al reference.

Substituting such for the elastic members in any of the above noted prior art systems are merely a selection of equivalents with no unexpected results occurring from such a substitution.

5. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tomiyama et al.

Applicants' attention is drawn to figures 1, 2 and four and the description thereof.

As noted, in figure 2, the examiner interprets the first projections as 2b,d and the second projections as 2c,e. The distance limitations are considered inherently present because the second projections are closer to the recording surface than the first projections 2b,d. The examiner interprets the last wherein phrase as met by this configuration of projections.

With respect to the amended limitation (elastic supports are fixed to the lens holder), as noted at col. 2, lines 54-59, the elastic elements 4 a,b,c,d are mounted onto the projections 2,b,c,d,e. Since these are formed/part of the lens holder 2, the elastic supports are fixed thereto.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2653

Hard copies of the application files are now separated from this examining corps, hence the examiner can answer no questions that requires a review of the file without sufficient lead-time.

Any inquiries concerning missing papers/references, etc. must be directed to Group 2600 Customer Services at (703) 306-0377.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M Psitos whose telephone number is (703) 308-1598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday 8 - 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (703) 305-6137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Aristotelis M Psitos
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2653



AMP